

REMARKS

Claims 1-8 are pending. By this response, claims 1 and 5 are amended. Reconsideration and allowance based on the above amendments and following remarks are respectfully requested.

The Office Action rejects claims 1-8 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ishigami et al. (US 2002/0118291) in view of Hatlestad (USP 5,555,464). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 1 recites, *inter alia*, photosensitive cells being arranged bidimensionally in such positions that each of the photosensitive cells is shifted in position substantially halfway from adjoining ones of the photosensitive cells in a horizontal and a vertical direction.

Claim 5 recites, *inter alia*, photosensitive cells which are arranged bidimensionally in such positions that each of the photosensitive cells is shifted in position substantially halfway from adjoining ones of the photosensitive cells in a horizontal and a vertical direction.

Applicants note that claims 1 and 5 have been amended in consideration of the suggestion made by the Examiner in the section titled “Response to Arguments.” Applicants note that the claims have not been amended exactly as the Examiner suggested, but the amendments provide the same effect as the suggested amendments by distinguishing the cell arrangement of the present invention from the cell arrangement of Ishigami and Hatlestad.

The claims define the photosensitive cells as being shifted substantially halfway from adjoining photosensitive cells in a horizontal and a vertical direction. This description produces a photosensitive cell arrangement like that of Fig. 2A and 4A of the present application. Therefore, every photosensitive cell does not align exactly with adjoining photosensitive cells in the vertical and horizontal direction as they have been shifted substantially halfway between the adjoining cells.

Ishigami and Hatlestad fail to teach or suggest the above claimed features. In Ishigami and Hatlestad, a lattice box arrangement of cells is taught. In this arrangement, each photosensitive cell is directly aligned with adjoining photosensitive cells in the vertical and horizontal direction. The photosensitive cells are not shifted in position substantially halfway from adjoining cells in the vertical and horizontal direction as claimed by Applicants.

Therefore, for the reasons set forth above, Applicants respectfully submit that the combination of Ishigami and Hatlestad fails to teach each and every feature of Applicants independent claims 1 and 5 as required. Dependent claims 2-4 and 6-8 are also distinguishable over the cited references for the above reasons as well as for the additional features they recite. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the reject are respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

For at least these reasons, it is respectfully submitted that claims 1-8 are distinguishable over the cited art. Favorable consideration and prompt allowance are earnestly solicited.

If the Examiner has any questions concerning this application, the Examiner is requested to contact Chad J. Billings, Reg. No. 48,917 at the telephone number of (703) 205-8000.

Application No. 09/657,413
Amendment dated June 6, 2006
After Final Office Action of March 6, 2006

Docket No.: 0378-0371P

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. § 1.16 or under 37 C.F.R. § 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

Dated: June 6, 2006

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Michael R. Cammarata
Registration No.: 39,491
BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP
8110 Gatehouse Road
Suite 100 East
P.O. Box 747
Falls Church, Virginia 22040-0747
(703) 205-8000
Attorney for Applicant